

**DISTRICT ATTORNEY
COUNTY OF NEW YORK
ONE HOGAN PLACE
New York, N. Y. 10013
(212) 335-9000**

OFFICER: RAMIRO RUIZ
TAX NUMBER: 939 384

DISCLOSURE ADVISORY

For the person named above, whom the People may call as a witness, please be advised as follows.

1. Ramiro Ruiz is a named defendant in the civil action Norman Jenkins v. City of New York, et al., 13-CIV-3405 (KPF) (AJP), filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, involving a police action incident on May 22, 2010.
2. The New York City Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) has deemed substantiated an allegation that on November 15, 2013, Ramiro Ruiz committed the violation of Abuse – Other. This finding arose out of a street encounter that started after a shots-fired incident at about 11:45 p.m. near MacDonough Street in the 73rd Precinct. The CCRB complainant was the uncle of a 16-year-old who was one of six people stopped and arrested by a team supervised by Sergeant Ruiz, who was an anti-crime supervisor that evening.

According to the officers, the anti-crime team was in a van, the officers heard shots extremely nearby, saw smoke from the gunshots, and saw a group of people running away from that area, in the direction of the van. One of those people was the complainant's nephew, who was wearing a red bubble jacket and, per Sergeant Ruiz and another officer, appeared to be jamming something into his front waistband. The Sergeant directed one of the officers, in substance, to get the guy in the red coat. Officers chased the fleeing group and apprehended the nephew and five other people (including one who video later showed to be one of two people exchanging shots). No gun was recovered from the nephew, but two guns and spent shelling casings were found at various other locations in connection with the incident. When surveillance footage demonstrated that the nephew was not the person who fired shots, he was released from the precinct, several hours later without charges and his arrest was voided. The CCRB concluded that Sergeant Ruiz was not justified in arresting the complainant's nephew because no weapon was recovered from his person and at the time the teen was brought back to the precinct, there was no indication that he had been in possession of a weapon.

2. The CCRB has deemed substantiated allegations that on July 3, 2015, Ramiro Ruiz committed the violations of Abuse – Stop and Abuse – Other. These findings arose out of a car stop of a taxi (for a broken tail light) on Beach Channel Drive at about 9:45 p.m. in the 100th Precinct. The CCRB complainant was a taxi passenger who was arrested for obstructing government administration and disorderly conduct.

Two officers explained to the CCRB that they had observed someone jump into the back seat of an occupied vehicle and then exit a few blocks down. The car stop was intended to determine whether a drug transaction had taken place. At the time of the car, besides the driver, there were still two passengers in the vehicle, one of whom was the CCRB complainant.

The CCRB concluded that there was no basis for the officers to detain the taxi passengers during the car stop and that the complainant's actions in response to being told he could not leave did not warrant his being stopped or arrest. The CCRB also concluded that "being that these officers described [the complainant's] actions in different ways and as happening at different times, they are not reliable facts when analyzing the justification for the stop."

4. The New York Police Department (NYPD) has deemed substantiated the allegation that on or about July 7, 2016, Ramiro Ruiz committed a Minor Procedural Violation in connection with a report, in that there was a discrepancy between the entries in the command log and on the prisoner property receipt.
5. The NYPD has deemed substantiated the allegation that on or about March 18, 2017, Ramiro Ruiz committed the violations of Other Department Rules/Procedures Violation (3 counts) and Impede Investigation. These findings led to the filing of Charges and Specifications alleging that Sergeant Ramiro Ruiz, while assigned to Narcotics Borough Queens South, (A) on or about and between March 18, 2017 and March 19, 2017, after having been informed about an error in the location of a firearm's discharge by other members of service, failed to provide said additional information to investigators; (B) on or about March 18, 2017, failed to immediately and properly secure and preserve the scene of a firearm's discharge or direct another member of service to do so; and (C) on or about March 18, 2017, and May 1, 2018, having additional information relevant to a firearm's discharge investigation, impeded said investigation by not being forthcoming in providing said information. He pleaded guilty to all three charges.

This matter involved an officer (not Ramiro Ruiz) who was sideswiped by a perpetrator during a car stop and fired one shot at the perpetrator's vehicle as it fled. The perpetrator eluded apprehension. These findings related to Sergeant Ruiz having failed to immediately and properly secure and preserve the scene of a firearms discharge or direct another member of service to do so; taking actions in violation of Department guidelines; failing to ensure that subordinates were wearing the color of the day while conducting enforcement duties in civilian clothes; and failed to provide additional information to investigators after having been informed about an error in the location of a firearm's discharge by other members of service.

6. The NYPD has deemed substantiated that on or about June 22, 2018, Ramiro Ruiz committed the violations of Other Department Rules/Procedures Violation; Official Statement Misleading Statement PG; Force – Physical Force; and Impede Investigations. This led to the issuance of Charges and Specifications alleging that Ramiro Ruiz, while assigned to Auto Crime Zone #1, on or about and between July 3, 2018 and July 4, 2018, (A) improperly and without justification, used force against [a

person] in that he kicked or stomped [that person]; (B) failed to render all necessary police service by failing to detain or arrest a suspect after said suspect had struck another member of the service in his presence; (C) wrongfully engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, in that he made incomplete, inaccurate, or otherwise misleading statements during an official Department interview as to events that occurred on or about and between July 3, 2018 and July 4, 2018; (D) wrongfully engaged in conduct prejudicial to the good order, efficiency, or discipline of the Department, in that he impeded a Department investigation by not identifying a member of the service, who had been present at an incident involving another member of the service, to investigating members of the service. He pleaded guilty to all four charges.

These charges arose out of an incident Sergeant Ruiz was off duty with another member of the NYPD at a restaurant. Sergeant Ruiz's companion was attempting to assist restaurant security to eject a third party. The third party became combative and struck the Sergeant's companion. Once the third party was subdued and on the floor, Sergeant Ruiz kicked/stomped that person. According to the NYPD, during the interview, he lied about the presence of other members of the service at the location of the incident. He also omitted the fact that he was consuming alcohol and that he had also visited two other establishments before arriving at the one at which the incident took place.

7. As of February 10, 2021, the CCRB has pending against Ramiro Ruiz the allegation of Force – Pepper Spray (2 counts). This allegation was made on June 2, 2020 about an incident on May 30, 2020.
8. As of February 10, 2021, the CCRB has pending against Ramiro Ruiz the allegation of Force – Physical Force. This allegation was made on June 23, 2020 about an incident on June 13, 2020.

Various publicly available websites and databases contain disciplinary information for certain law enforcement officers. Information in such databases about this officer is not necessarily included in this advisory.

Any information herein regarding civil lawsuits against an officer is not necessarily a complete list of civil lawsuits in which that officer is a defendant.

Allegations of misconduct that have not been substantiated and are not pending (including, but not limited to, findings of unsubstantiated, unfounded, and exonerated), and allegations of technical infractions, are not subject to disclosure and are not included in this advisory.

The decision to include information in this advisory does not represent a conclusion by the People that it is required to be disclosed.

The People reserve the right to oppose or move to limit the use of any information included herein or disclosed in the future.

If you have any questions, please contact the Assistant District Attorney assigned to the case on which you are receiving this advisory.

Date: February 26, 2021